



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,026	03/13/2007	Jozef Thomas Martinus Van Beek	EPC-019	4725
25962 7590 12/17/2008 SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P. 17950 PRESTON RD, SUITE 1000 DALLAS, TX 75252-5793				
EXAMINER KUSUMAKAR, KAREN M				
ART UNIT 2829		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 12/17/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/578,026

Applicant(s)

VAN BEEK ET AL.

Examiner

KAREN M. KUSUMAKAR

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/8/08
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The changes made to the specification in the amendment filed 9/08/08 on page 10 (third paragraph) overcome drawing objections a) and b). As to objections c) and d), Applicant states in same paragraph that Figures 1 and 2 have been amended. However, Examiner does not see amended drawings filed. Perhaps they were accidentally omitted with the filing of the 9/8/08 amendment? Objections c) and d) remain and are recited below:

c. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

d. Figure 2 shows etch stop layer 18 being Al, a conducting material, whereas the claim indicates that the etch stop layer being electrically insulating material.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed 9/8/08 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: In line 6 of claim 1, Applicant discloses the substrate being non-inert against fluorine chemistry. There is no support for this limitation in the specification. On page 9, lines 24-33, Applicant discloses the substrate is etchable with fluorine, but this is not an adequate support for the amended claim. Etchable is not the same as non-inert. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-7 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "non-inert" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "non-inert" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. On page 9, lines 24-33, Applicant discloses the substrate is etchable with fluorine, but etchable is not the same as non-inert. Non-inert is relative given that

fluorine is highly electronegative and it reacts with everything to some degree if given enough time.

4. Claims 2-7 and 12-16 are rejected at least because they depend from claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 8, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by ***Kubena et al. (US 6,580,138)***.

As to claim 8, Kubena teaches an electronic device comprising a micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) element at a first side of a substrate (See abstract and Fig. 12A), the MEMS element comprising a first (contact electrode 38-2) and a second electrode (element 22-2, Fig. 12A) that is movable towards and from the first electrode between a closed and an opened position (col. 2:30-33), and that is separated from the first electrode by an air gap in its opened position (Fig. 12A), wherein the device comprises an etch stop layer (silicon dioxide layer 34, Fig. 12A) between the first electrode and the substrate (col. 6:46-48), the etch stop layer comprising a substantially non-conducting, fluorine

chemistry inert material (silicon dioxide is resistant to fluorine) and the substrate being etchable with fluorine chemistry (Substrate is silicon and silicon is etchable with fluorine).

As to claim 9, Kubena further teaches the etch stop layer comprises a Group_IV n-oxide (silicon dioxide, col. 6:46-48).

As to claim 11, Kubena further teaches the substrate is a silicon substrate (col. 7:15-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Kubena et al. (US 6,580,138) in view of Lei et al. (US 7,279,369)***.

As to claim 10, Kubena teaches all the limitations of claim 9 but does not explicitly teach the etch stop layer comprises HfO_2 , ZrO_2 , Al_2O_3 or TiO_2 . However, Lei does teach an etch stop layer made of HfO_2 , ZrO_2 , Al_2O_3 or TiO_2 (col. 8:33-35). Lei shows that it is known to use any of these elements as an etch stop layer, and it has been held that choosing from a list of known elements is obvious and undistinguishable over prior art. See MPEP 2144.07 and *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-Delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAREN M. KUSUMAKAR whose telephone number is (571) 270-3520. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30a - 5:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2829

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. M. K./

Examiner, Art Unit 2829

12/9/2008

/Ha T. Nguyen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2829